Remarks

Claims 1-11 and 13-29 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13-15, 17, 18, 23-28 are amended, claim 29 is added, and claim 12 is cancelled without prejudice. The Examiner's reconsideration is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

Claim Rejections- § 112

The Examiner rejects claims 5 and 18 under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 for failing to provide sufficient antecedent basis for the recitation of "the seeker end-user device".

Claim 5 has been amended to depend from claim 2, which recites, *inter alia*, "a seeker end-user device". Claim 18 has been amended to replace "the seeker end-user device" with "the seeker device" and claim 18 depends from claim 17, which recites, *inter alia*, "a seeker device".

As amended, claims 5 and 18 are believed to have sufficient antecedent basis for each of their respective elements.

Withdrawal of the rejections under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-19, and 21-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0002521 to Traversat, as set forth by pages 2-13 of the Office Action.

It is respectfully submitted that, at the very least, Traversat does not disclose *at least one of the plurality of end-user devices post their at least one identity file on the*

P2P network using a Web service request to a Web Service Provider, as recited inter alia, in amended claim 1.

The Examiner suggests that <u>Traversat</u> teaches end-user devices posting their identity files on a P2P network. However, <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches (in paragraph 297, 300-306) the use of discovery messages, and not identity files that have a defined or structured format. Even assuming *arguendo*, that messages were interpreted as files, <u>Traversat</u> still fails to teach the messages being posted on a P2P network using a Web service request to a Web Service Provider. While <u>Traversat</u> discusses protocols such as a peer discovery protocol and a peer resolver protocol, <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches that the protocols may be implemented using a common messaging layer (see paragraph 231). Indeed <u>Traversat</u> teaches (in paragraph 297) that "[p]referably, the peer discovery protocol does not require a reliable transport". Further, <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches (in paragraph 168) use of an FTP service, but not using a Web service, much less using a Web service request to a Web Service Provider.

For at least the foregoing reasons, <u>Traversat</u> fails to anticipate claim 1. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u>.

Further, claims 2-4 and 6-9 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1.

It further respectfully submitted that at the very least, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose *downloading a search form from the Web service provider to the seeker device, wherein the search form includes a plurality of search fields for identifying the potential collaborators*, as recited *inter alia*, in amended claims 17 and 28.

The Examiner essentially contends that "*downloading a search form from a Web Service Provider*" is disclosed by paragraphs 98, 114, or 158 of <u>Traversat</u>.

However, there is no disclosure in the cited paragraphs of downloading a search form, much less downloading a search from a Web Service Provider. For example, paragraph 98 of <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches bridging between different implementations of peer-to-peer networks, such as Gnutella and Napster, paragraph 114 of <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches including a scope field in messages sent between peers, and paragraph 158 of <u>Traversat</u> merely teaches using a discovery service to search for peers or groups of peers. Further, there is no disclosure elsewhere in <u>Traversat</u> of downloading a search form, much less downloading a search from a Web Service Provider. Thus, it also follows that there is no disclosure in <u>Traversat</u> of a *"downloading a search form from the Web service provider to the seeker device, wherein the search form includes a plurality of search fields for identifying the potential collaborators"*.

For at least the foregoing reasons, <u>Traversat</u> fails to anticipate claims 17 and 28. Thus, claims 17 and 28 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u>.

Claims 10 and 17 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> for at least similar reasons to claims 17 and 28.

For example, claims 10 and 17 have been amended, inter alia, to recite *downloading a search form to the seeker device, wherein the search form includes a plurality of search fields for identifying the potential collaborators.*

Claim 12 is cancelled without prejudice and claims 11, 13, 15-16, and 29 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 10.

Claims 18-19 and 21-23, and 25-26 are believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 17.

It is further submitted that <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose *narrowing the search by searching only the identity files whose filenames include data for at least one of the search fields*, as recited in amended claim 14.

For example, there is no teaching in <u>Traversat</u> of narrowing a search of identity files whose files names include data for at least one search field of a previously provided or downloaded search form.

Thus, claim 14 is believed to be patentable over <u>Traversat</u> for at least the foregoing reason and at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 10.

Claim 24 is additionally believed to be patentable of <u>Traversat</u> for at least similar reasons to claim 14 and at least by virtue of its dependence from claim 17. For example, claim 24 has been amended to recite, inter alia, *the search is restricted to those identity files whose filenames include data for at least one of the search fields*.

Withdrawal of the claim rejections under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections- § 103

Claims 5 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over <u>Traversat</u>, in view of U.S. Patent Pub. 2003/0217140 to <u>Burbeck</u>, as set forth by pages 13-14 of the Office Action.

The above 103 rejection is premised, in part, on the Examiner's reliance on <u>Traversat</u> as disclosing all elements of claims 1 and 17, where claim 5 depends from claim 1 and claim 20 depends from claim 17. However, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose all the elements of claims 1 and 17 for the reasons discussed above. For example, <u>Traversat</u> does not disclose end-user devices post their at least one identity file on the P2P network using a Web service request to a Web Service Provider or a search form provided by or

downloaded from a Web Service Provider.

Further the deficiencies of <u>Traversat</u> in this regard is not cured by <u>Burbeck</u>. For example, <u>Burbeck</u> is merely concerned with (e.g., in paragraph 20) the persisting of a node's reputation in a network having transient network communities, but makes no mention of end-user devices posting identity files on a P2P network using a Web Service Provider or the use of a search form provided by or downloaded from a Web Service Provider.

Accordingly, the combination of <u>Traversat</u> and <u>Burbeck</u> cannot render obvious claims 5 and 20.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all the claims now pending in the application are in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration is respectfully requested.

By: _____

Donald B. Paschburg
Reg. No. 33,753
Attorney for Applicant

Correspondence Address:

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830
(732) 321-3191